

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants:	Indra LAKSONO		
Title:	SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR MULTIPLE CHANNEL VIDEO TRANSCODING		
App. No.:	09/990,976	Filed:	11/21/2001
Examiner:	Allen C. WONG	Group Art Unit:	2621
Atty. Dkt. No.:	1459-VIXS012	Confirmation No.:	4211

Mail Stop AMENDMENT
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL WITH INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Dear Commissioner:

In order to comply more fully with 37 C.F.R. § 1.56, as currently construed by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, Applicants are providing further information regarding the related patent applications to this matter. Attached hereto, along with the Information Disclosure Statement Form PTO/SB/08a, is a list of actions for related applications for the patent application referenced above, entitled "Actions on the Merits by the U.S.P.T.O."

The information on the list includes the related applications and their filing dates, type of actions, date of actions, and substantive actions taken by the U.S.P.T.O. regarding the claims. The substantive actions include rejections, notices of allowance, and issuance. The rejections include not only statutory rejections, but also include non-statutory rejections (e.g., obviousness-type double patenting rejections). Other actions by the U.S.P.T.O. do not appear in the listing, as these would be less likely to provide a basis for rejecting a claim in a different patent application. As one example, if an office action only includes a restriction requirement, it is not listed. Also, the list does not include objections (e.g., drawing objections, specification objections, etc.).

The list of actions for the related patent applications should be reasonably up to date. However, Applicants note that correspondence from the U.S.P.T.O. may have been mailed and not yet received at the correspondence address when this paper is received by the U.S.P.T.O.

Thus, the Examiner is requested to review the patent applications listed to determine if recent actions have not yet made the list.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to review the related patent applications for rejections to determine whether references and other information cited in the related patent applications would be relevant to any or all claims in the Present Application. If the patent applications in the list properly qualify as prior art with respect to the Present Application, Applicants also respectfully request the Examiner to review such proper prior-art patent applications for relevancy with respect to any or all claims in the Present Application. Applicants further respectfully request the Examiner to examine allowed and issued claims in the related patent applications for double patenting issues with respect to any or all claims in the Present Application. To the extent the patent applications can be used for any other reason not listed, the Examiner is encouraged to use the patent applications in any manner that allows the Examiner to make a more informed decision regarding the Present Application, including its claims.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the Present Application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the Present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

June 12, 2008
Date

/Ryan S. Davidson/
Ryan S. Davidson, Reg. No. 51,596
LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP
5914 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78730
(512) 439-7100 (phone)
(512) 439-7199 (fax)